

MASTER PLAN HEARING
HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK

YANO HALL
CAPTAIN COOK, HAWAII
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1974

I N D E X

<u>Testimony and Questions</u>	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Bill Kawahara	9
Mrs. Fran McConoughey	16
Mrs. C. J. Kimberly	20
Mr. Renwick Tassill	20
Mr. Alika Cooper	32
Appendix A	42

MASTER PLAN HEARING
HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK
YANO HALL
CAPTAIN COOK, HAWAII
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1974

Meeting convened at 1:00 p.m.

SUPERINTENDENT G. BRYAN HARRY: Good afternoon, I'm Bryan Harry, Superintendent of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. I'm over here with others of the National Park Service in one of three cities that we are meeting with people to discuss the master plan for Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and to discuss proposals for the establishment of wilderness in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. Because of an Act of Congress on the Wilderness Act there must be a separate official hearing on wilderness. That will take place tomorrow beginning at 9 o'clock in the morning and will continue on as long as necessary beginning at 1 o'clock.

It's pretty hard to talk about wilderness in the park unless you have some idea of some of the other things going on. It's hard to plan; it's hard for some of the people to figure what the wilderness proposals will mean if they don't know what's in the wind on master plan or what should be in the wind but nobody's thought of. So today the purpose of this meeting is to hear your ideas for the master plan proposals for Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. In addition to that, the record will be open for another month following these meetings so that you can send in your written comments to me at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park until March 28.

I'd like to introduce the members of the crew that's been working on these plans. At this end of the table, Bob Barrel, State Director

of the National Park Service; in the middle, Ron Mortimore, our Park Planner; and at the far end, Howard Chapman, Regional Director. Howard, could you give us a few thoughts this morning.

MR. HOWARD CHAPMAN: If you don't mind I'll stay here because I would hope to keep some informality in the session this afternoon, in order to achieve the primary objective which is to hear from you as to your reaction and your feelings with regard to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park master plan. From my standpoint and from the standpoint of the National Park Service, I would like to encourage you to participate in this as a decision-making process because what we are presenting to you this afternoon are a series of alternatives, obviously with a recommendation among these alternatives as to the direction we feel this master plan should take. However, before this master plan is approved, we want to hear from those people who are going to be affected by it. By all people, if at all possible, so that the final master plan really will reflect not only the National Park Service in its planning and its responsibilities to carry out requirements under the law, but also that it reflects the user--the individual who is concerned about parks and their management. So I encourage you to participate in this process and let us have the benefit of your thoughts and your feelings.

MR. HARRY: Thank you, Howard, At this time I think the best thing to do is to have Ron Mortimore give us a brief summary of what the various alternatives that we've considered are and a summary of the plan that we are proposing. Ron.

MR. RON MORTIMORE: Bryan, I think I'll try to speak without a microphone too if you can hear me, otherwise I'll be dragging it around

and make it more difficult. It's a little more informal. First, perhaps the best thing to do is explain what all these maps are about.

This one that you see here is a portrayal of the current draft proposal--this is our recommendation as portrayed in the document. We also put these other maps up to indicate the alternative proposals, which we also studied along with this one. Also these were used as a part of the planning process with this particular proposal. This is our recommendation at this time--those are the alternatives which we would like to have you look at as well. Any comments that you have on them are welcome because this is by no means a set plan--at this time it is still a draft proposal, but it is our current proposal.

Perhaps the biggest part of the proposal is the adding of lands to the park and this is really in sort of two sections. The big red line that you see here is the current authorized boundary as it is at this time. We propose certain changes within the authorized boundary adding in those certain land.

First, the Olaa Forest Tract which is now owned by the Federal Government, and managed by the National Park Service but there is some question about whether it is actually officially part of the park. So we propose to make that clear whereby that is actually part of the park and clear up that possible discrepancy. However, there is a small parcel in between the Olaa Forest and Kilauea Crater which we would propose to delete--that's somewhat built up with subdivisions, a lot of exotic plants, it is not necessary to the addition, a lot of development in there that we don't want to disrupt. Hope that small parcel of land is deleted.

Along the Chain of Craters there's a parcel of land here which is authorized but which is now owned by Campbell Estate, I believe. This is a mixed ohia-fern forest--quite a fine example--and it follows parallel to the Chain of Craters. We propose to add that.

Coming down here to Kalapana, there's a large section of land here most of which is now subdivided. We would propose to delete most of that from the park but add a small parcel along the Kalapana Road to provide a little more buffer there for the development and for the resource now in existence. The Kalapana Visitor Center is about right there; the buffer zone there mauka is to sort of give you a little more space between the road the development which would be occurring mauka of that.

Down here a small parcel at the far south end of the park, which again is part of the authorized boundary but not a part of the park. The Park Service proposes to add that. Essentially it's a continuation of the Great Crack all the way down to the ocean.

As far as proposed land, these will require essentially two parcels, the Hualalai addition and the Southwest Rift Zone of Mauna Loa, and a strip along the ocean. These are both parcels of lands which are not now authorized; they require Congressional approval. In addition, we would propose that in that authorization there would be authorization to purchase the lands rather than the situation as it is now in these areas in which it is difficult for us to purchase these lands. Previously it was bought by the State and donated to the Park Service. So we propose that there be a change in that. That question came up the other day. Would the State have to purchase these lands and give them to us?

No, it would be tax money, but it would be out of the Federal pocket rather than the State pocket.

We're talking about two parcels about 100,000 acres here, mainly the summit of Hualalai, the saddle area between Hualalai and Mauna Loa, and the Southwest Rift Zone of Mauna Loa down to about 8,000 feet which is essentially the beginning of the vegetation line and pretty much follows all the way around except to a little lower elevation here. It includes also the Mauna Loa Observatory which sets about in this area here.

Then, as I mentioned before, a strip of water 1/4 mile all along the coast, essentially to protect the inter-tidal zone. The line is now at the high, high tide line or the vegetation line as described now by the State. We would like a little more authority to be able to manage that inter-tidal zone and inshore waters. It's about 5,000 acres, 1/4 mile wide, extending the length of the coast.

As far as development is concerned on the existing park area, we have pretty much the pattern we had before; not much change. Visitors coming in as they do now to Kilauea, spending some time around that area, generally the bulk of them passing on through and on to Kona, and vice-versa. Eventually, we would like to reconstruct the Chain of Craters Road but, obviously, we can't do it now until Pele decides that she's through with her current operations. So we'll probably have to wait some time for that. We do feel this is important, and we'd like to re-establish that connection as it is an important part of the park use program.

Adjacent to that in the Hilina Pali-Ainahou area, this is what we call the wilderness threshold. It's simply a sort of introduction to the wilderness or a sort of transition zone between the major developed areas and the wilderness itself--small campgrounds and very, very low-standard roads, picnic areas, that kind of thing. A place for people to get away from the major visitation area, kind of the edge of the wilderness, get a feeling of the backcountry without actually going into it. Of course, from there you would have several trailheads to get from that area into the backcountry area. Same thing for the Mauna Loa Strip where the road goes up to about 6,000 to 7,000 feet, and essentially the same thing--a wilderness threshold zone.

Major change perhaps in development is a small interpretive development here at the Olaa Forest. This area will be maintained as wilderness in accordance with the plan that you'll hear about tomorrow. A small parcel on the Kilauea side of Wright Road, which essentially is dedicated to a small interpretive facility, opportunity for the visitor to get into the fern forest, perhaps some sort of elevated trail to keep them off the very fragile system of plants there. A place for them to get off to see this interesting fern forest, but maintaining this essentially as a sort of scientific research.

On the Hualalai side, talking about development here--a sort of development center not on the top of Hualalai but about halfway between there and Ahuaumi Heiau, which is about right here. Small developments--small campground, picnic areas, probably a small administrative unit, interpretation, opportunity for a scenic drive from the highway just above Kailua climbing the mountain up to this elevation at the base of Hualalai summit, essentially. No specific location for this road now,

need for additional studies. We're talking about approximately 15 miles of road, probably about 300 feet right-of-way. Again, this needs additional study; we don't want to say specifically where that has to go now because we need additional work to make sure, for one thing, we don't disrupt land use down here any more than is absolutely necessary. We don't want to go through a residential area or through a major coffee plantation--that sort of thing. So that will take some time. So that's the main points of the proposal as we have them now in the master plan. We did also, of course, look at these other alternatives.

Alternative A. These are the same numbers that you will find in the impact statement, which accompanies the master plan. Alternative A is essentially a status quo plan for the park. Very little change except for the interpretive development at Olaa Forest and the re-institution of the road corridor between Chain of Craters and Kalapana; but other than that, not really much change. Essentially a status quo plan. No additional land other than those now authorized as indicated here; but no addition of lands along Hualalai. This is one of the alternatives.

Alternative B. Essentially the earlier master plan which a lot of you have seen and probably discussed quite a bit. Again, essentially the same additional lands as we have on the current draft proposal except there's a little less land up here along the north side of Mauna Loa because of the proposed parkway which is a major feature of that particular plan at that time. A parkway going all the way from Kalapana up past Kilauea, up along the north shoulder of Mauna Loa, through the saddle between Hualalai and Mauna Loa, then descending down past Honaunau

Forest and terminating at City of Refuge. Approximately a total of 90 miles, it would give you a sea to mountain to sea road. Same kind of development as Hualalai except that there will be opportunity to get very close to Ahuaumi Heiau and Judd Trail for special interpretation there. Again, small amount of camping and picnicking, and that kind of thing. Also, Honaunau Forest--the possibility of interpreting an area there--a deep fern forest, combination fern-ohia, a little bit of koa, kind of interesting botanical complex there. Then continuing on down to City of Refuge at that point. That's essentially Alternative B--the proposal as presented in 1971.

Alternative C is essentially a non-development proposal as you might call it. It's a little less land added around Hualalai and Mauna Loa, not coming as far down. Essentially retaining it as near wilderness kind of area, managing the special resources that are there--historic and biological resources are important there--but not providing any public access other than by trail. This, we felt, was obviously not good as this one over here because we did want to provide some kind of facility for the public up to that area. But this is one of the things being talked about--being considered.

We have on this wall simply a map showing the Kalapana Extension and also the Kilauea Forest Reserve which has been discussed by some local groups as a possible addition to the park because of some very interesting botanical and bird populations that are there. Because of the special problems involved in the Kalapana Extension we felt that during the public meetings there would be some reference to that, and this is more for information than anything else.

So again, that is the proposal as shown in the master plan. These are alternatives which are in the impact statement. Thank you.

MR. HARRY: Let's take a 10-minute recess and maybe you'd like to come up and look at the maps and talk individually with Ron before we start hearing any comments from you.

(Short recess.)

MR. BILL KAWAHARA, COUNCILMAN, COUNTY OF HAWAII: How will the park acquire the lands--by purchase or condemnation? Are the property owners willing to negotiate or sell?

MR. HARRY: The land would be purchased by Land and Water Conservation funds. The purchase of lands would be on the basis of a willing seller and a willing buyer.

MR. KAWAHARA: Would it be possible to build a road across park land?

MR. HARRY: I think that there's no question but it's more difficult in the procedures today to make roads that affect any park, whether it's National, State, or County type parks. The requirements of environmental impact statements make it pretty tough to push into parks with roads. This would be a good point for planners from both the County and State and Federal people to look at what road needs are across Hualalai. If legislation went through to add this to the park, I think that it would be more difficult.

MR. KAWAHARA: Well, let me bring up some things that I have in mind, and that's plans for the cross-island highway from Hilo to Kona. By your acquiring that land between Hualalai and Mauna Loa, it would be creating a direct block to the road or corridor.

So again, that is the proposal as shown in the master plan. These are alternatives which are in the impact statement. Thank you.

MR. HARRY: Let's take a 10-minute recess and maybe you'd like to come up and look at the maps and talk individually with Ron before we start hearing any comments from you.

(Short recess.)

MR. BILL KAWAHARA, COUNCILMAN, COUNTY OF HAWAII: How will the park acquire the lands--by purchase or condemnation? Are the property owners willing to negotiate or sell?

MR. HARRY: The land would be purchased by Land and Water Conservation funds. The purchase of lands would be on the basis of a willing seller and a willing buyer.

MR. KAWAHARA: Would it be possible to build a road across park land?

MR. HARRY: I think that there's no question but it's more difficult in the procedures today to make roads that affect any park, whether it's National, State, or County type parks. The requirements of environmental impact statements make it pretty tough to push into parks with roads. This would be a good point for planners from both the County and State and Federal people to look at what road needs are across Hualalai. If legislation went through to add this to the park, I think that it would be more difficult.

MR. KAWAHARA: Well, let me bring up some things that I have in mind, and that's plans for the cross-island highway from Hilo to Kona. By your acquiring that land between Hualalai and Mauna Loa, it would be creating a direct block to the road or corridor.

MR. HARRY: I think that's true, unless at this stage we got together and figured out what the plans should be. The last time we met with the County, which was some time ago, because it was before this was in preparation, they had about three alternate routes. One of which would cross this saddle, and this would affect that; one of which went down by Hualalai and this would not affect that. There is also some possibilities that depending on how high a standard of road you're talking of, it could be. Chuck Schuster brought this out--why don't you have this a park road here and this a park road over there. Or why don't you have a park road up to here but leave a corridor for the State to have a State road up to the saddle highway. Now, I wouldn't look upon that as a panacea of a sure way to get a road across there because we probably would have a different idea of standards of the road than what the State would be. I look at this across here as being about the standard of the Crater Rim Road along by Thurston Lava Tube. That's a fairly winding road that goes up and down with the land but it's 2-lane, black-top road.

MR. KAWAHARA: Would it be a limited access road?

MR. HARRY: No sir. If this became park it would be limited access within the park.

MR. KAWAHARA: Would that mean that people owning property along the road may have access?

MR. HARRY: Let's say, we're not locked in on this, but I would feel that a road up through here would be a scenic drive and that access off it would be periodic--not everybody having their driveway off it, but you would go off into road systems outside. These would be adequate so

that anybody can get to anywhere along the side but not like it is right along here.

MR. KAWAHARA: That would pretty much follow the present Bishop Estate Road.

MR. HARRY: Yes.

MR. MORTIMORE: Bryan, we were talking about actually indicating in the legislation the necessary specific number of exits, if we had to. Now this is a higher order than what we are talking about over here because that was a parkway kind of a thing. This, I would assume, would be less restricted than that is. We were talking about so many exits, or an exit every so many miles. We're still in the process of working on it. So certainly here it is even less restrictive, so I would think it's only a matter of working it out.

MR. BARREL: I can see no actual problem to that road since the prime intent of that road really just from our standpoint is to give access to the base of the summit of Hualalai to allow passenger vehicles to get up there. So the final standard of the road will be negotiable as will a number of accesses from abutting land there too. I would see ample access along that road.

MR. KAWAHARA: Well, actually I would like to see something like this happen. I think this is good for the people and if the property owners are willing to turn over their lands. It's a private matter and worked out by negotiations as far as price. I think this is all very nice; I'd like to see something happen. I think I'd be in favor of the park's extension to Hualalai, including the Ahuaumi Heiau and creating a wilderness area. I think that it's now been disputed that

the National Park Service has done a good job with the land management and control of destructive animals. This needs to be done, I believe, quite a bit more on Hualalai. Much of the vegetation up there is getting reduced and damaged because of grazing by animals. I'm sure that the National Park people will do a good job of land management and will develop the area so that the people will enjoy the view that accompanies this. The area up there is presently inaccessible.

My concern from the standpoint of local government is whether or not the National Park would be absolutely firm against the corridor for the cross-island highway. I think this is a real necessary project that will be coming up in the not too distant future is a building demand for a shorter route between the two areas, and this would be the logical corridor. The distance between Hilo and Kona at this point would be about 55 or 60 miles. Now I believe that the State is planning on putting in a short cut from Pohakuloa to Puuwaa, and that road will continue on to Keahole. That road will cut the distance between Hilo and Kona by about 25 to 30 miles, and that will be quite a help. That would be a much less expensive project. Within the near foreseeable future there is going to be a high-speed traffic arterial between the west and east side. I just want to be absolutely sure that there is not going to be any hassle about a right-of-way over the saddle.

At the present time the only thing that is holding up the project is the military using the lands for maneuvers and target practice, and I don't hesitate to say that there is a lot of bad to this. We need that to happen. We need to provide the military with a place to practice their war games and target shooting, but in my observation I see that

they are doing a lot of harm. All those shells that they are lobbing across there--I see it all the time because I go over the Saddle Road three times a week. They are firing those missiles, and everytime one of them lands over on the other side it starts a fire. The fire goes on and on. Think of all the destruction that they are doing, and all the duds that they are scattering throughout the place. Pretty soon it will be like Kahoolawe, and it will take a thousand years to clear up the area. I don't know what the answer is. We need to keep up our defenses. We need to assist the military, and this is a good place for the military to conduct their exercises. But it is a lot of land--beautiful land that might be used otherwise. This is the only thing, as I understand it, that's holding up construction of the cross-island highway.

Many, many years ago, perhaps hundreds of years ago, the Hawaiians with their bare hands constructed a highway from Kona to Hilo. You can still see the remains of this fine road called the Judd Highway. It's a path about 5 or 6 feet wide, rocks lined on both sides, and the road is smoothed with cinders. It was the cross-island highway that the Hawaiians used to get from Kona to Hilo to conduct whatever business they had. This highway, as you know, just skirts the Ahuaumi Heiau--so it's no big thing. It will be a relatively easy thing for us to build a highway across for all practical purposes. I must say that a highway such as that would be something for a type of economic use, and at the same time, I think such a highway would serve as a scenic highway. I would like to see the National Park people not discourage such a highway.

I would like to see the National Park acquire a lot of those lands up there and put those lands in good custody and develop the land, and beautify the lands for the edification of the public. So I have said that I'm in favor of the whole; I'm in favor of the Department of the Interior getting those lands. When we think of Kauai and working on the project of taking over some of the Napali property you had quite a bit of opposition for some reason; I don't know what the exact reasons were. I understand you had some opposition during a meeting in Hilo on this property.

Another thing is that--about your taking over the 1/4-mile strip along the shore at Puna. I'm a little doubtful about that. I think you will run into some opposition from the State, as the State is supposed to control the water along the shore. Have you talked to the State about that?

MR. BARREL: They know that this is our proposal.

MR. KAWAHARA: Are they willing to go along with it?

MR. BARREL: We have as yet no indication from them as to their position. I think we would agree that so far as we're concerned our interest is not who has responsibility for that strip of water but rather that adequate regulations be put on the shoreline along there so that the literal resources will continue on into the future. So this is a proposal, but it's by no means the only way to accomplish the same end.

MR. KAWAHARA: What would be the timetable? How soon would you expect something like this to be completed? 10 years? 5 years?

MR. CHAPMAN: I think it would be very difficult to give an exact time because what would be required first of all is as we are in meeting now, getting how you feel and coming to a proposal that could be presented to Congress. There would be Congressional actions, Congressional hearings to be held on this. I would say the absolute earliest we probably could see anything in action in Congress would be several years before we could even come to a concluding plan. It's implementation on the basis of moneys for land acquisition is dependent upon money that would be available to us by Congress. There again, we must add several years. So when you said 5, you were talking about the absolute minimum.

MR. KAWAHARA: Would you work on the land acquisition by increments?

MR. CHAPMAN: I think the efforts of the Service today would be more to try to achieve as much as possible of it at one time, but then again recognizing that as we negotiate with different owners that it is going to require different lengths of time to accomplish it.

MR. KAWAHARA: Well, I've taken up enough of your time. Thank you very much.

MRS. FRAN McCONOUGHIEY: I'm Field Director for the Girl Scouts Council on this side of the island. I was wondering if you could take just a few minutes to explain why you are supporting this particular alternative as opposed to particularly Alternative B, since as I understand is the one that is currently considered the master plan for the park development.

MR. BARREL: That was an earlier draft. There is no master plan at the moment, and that's what we're working toward here.

MRS. McCONOUGHNEY: O.K. so this was an earlier draft. But why this (current proposal) instead of this (earlier draft)? What are your reasons for that?

MR. HARRY: Well, I think there were several reasons. Foremost, because there was an enormous amount of opposition. Trying to analyze that opposition, it came from people who seem to me genuinely felt that we were destroying great pieces of good land, and that the road itself was so high that it didn't accomplish the purpose of a cross-island highway. The other reason is that the geologists told us that our alignment paralleled the rift zones crossing, and crossed two of them, and that if we're having problems with Mauna Ulu we were certainly going to have many more problems on this highway. So we backed off. What's your feeling?

MRS. McCONOUGHNEY: Well, the one question that flashed in my mind is that there doesn't seem to be much difference in the areas involved. I presume when you say you got opposition to the point that you were destroying large chunks of valuable land, that you were talking about the degree of development--the two highly developed areas on the summit.

MR. HARRY: No, building the road itself, I believe. Now there may be other people who have a better insight than I do. Are you in favor of that alternate?

MRS. McCONOUGHNEY: No, I like the proposal that you've got now. I think just as well I'm not particularly concerned about a cross-island highway. I think that there are other alternates available. I'm not altogether sure that the kind of time span that they're talking about that there's going to be a need for a high-speed road; we may not have any high-speed traveling.

MR. BARREL: Let's make very clear that the parkway proposal of the earlier plan was not and should never have been considered a high-speed, cross-island highway. As Bryan has already said, it did go too high. As proposed there it would be a much lower speed, a much lower standard road as far as speed is concerned than a high-speed connecting link would be. Don't consider that alternate as providing a cross-island highway.

MR. MORTIMORE: That, I think, was a matter of confusion pretty much throughout the study. It was difficult because particularly on Hawaii they were looking for a cross-island route and this appeared, obviously, to be a solution to that.

MRS. McCONOUGHIEY: I also presume that there would be a substantial difference in the cost of developing this particular plan as opposed to this parkway-roadway thing?

MR. MORTIMORE: I think the chances of selling that (earlier draft) as opposed to selling this (current proposal) is a lot of difference, because that would involve an awful lot of money, and then how much are you gaining by building that much road?

MR. HARRY: We've had a lot of change in philosophy. It has happened that in just the span of years that people were working on alternate B and this one, throughout the Nation we've backed off some from our road building. So that it might well be that if you wanted Alternate B maybe we're the wrong outfit. We'd have a hard time getting the money to pull off Alternate B. That's speculation on my part.

QUESTION FROM AUDIENCE: Why can't you get money to purchase land sooner? We're involved in the City of Refuge expansion. On one hand

that land is tied up as a national park expansion and you can't use that land. State Tax Department says that's beach property that's very valuable land so we're going to assess you for the highest and best use. We're caught in between paying very high taxes for a piece of land we can't possibly do anything with. We have to wait for the national park to decide what they're going to do. It's a real problem for the landowner. I mean, he may be willing at the time you bring up your plan to go along with it, but as the time gets longer and longer he becomes more and more reluctant to cooperate unless he can be compensated for the delay.

MR. HARRY: I genuinely agree. I think one of the problems we have in the existing legislation is that we have an authorized boundary but no mechanism to acquire the land. It's unfair to the people who are within that boundary. I think, if we decide to do a certain thing there ought to be set up a mechanism to do it. For example, in the existing park, it says it's within the authorized boundary but there are very tight restrictions on the use of Federal moneys to acquire the land. I propose that if we did want this proposal there should be in the legislation authority to purchase and use Land and Water Conservation moneys to do it.

MR. MORTIMORE: That is stated that way in this proposal now.

MR. CHAPMAN: I think this is why landowners are generally reluctant to give you an answer because I'm sure it virtually obligates you forever whenever that boundary changes and you lie within it. In return you have no feeling that the commitment is going to be met by the Government within a certain period of time.

The only thing I can say is I think today, in terms of the acquisition program within the National Park Service and with a greatly increased citizen concern about rounding out these, that we will probably see greater efforts to appropriate the money and to acquire the lands on a speedier proposition than has our history been in the past. We've seen that happen in the recently authorized Golden Gate National Recreation Area where the Congress has indicated that everything will be possibly done to acquire those lands within 3 years. Now that is land that we have an authorization to go to \$62 million in order to acquire approximately 36,000 acres of land.

So the more recent acquisitions, I think, are beginning to recognize more and more the problems that this kind of an authorization makes to the private landowners--because they're stuck. Where some development takes place, they recognize it escalates prices also. So this kind of moves some of this action along. So all I can say to you is that I think I can see some answer that may indicate that we may have a better track record in the future than we did in the past.

MR. HARRY: We've been mostly sort of in recess, informally talking and answering questions, but I believe there is someone who wishes to make a statement.

MRS. C. J. KIMBERLY. This is the Kona Outdoor Circle Statement.
(Enclosed statement read by Mrs. Kimberly.)

MR. RENWICK TASSILL: You know your Alternative B, and the road that goes across. A couple of years ago when you first came up with this plan--again, I repeat--that there was a number of people who were in opposition to this plan. Yet, today, in reading many of the studies

KONA OUTDOOR CIRCLE STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN FOR HAWAII VOLCANOES
NATIONAL PARK

We of the Kona Outdoor Circle feel that the proposed site acquisition and deletion of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park in general would be of benefit to both the local community and visitors to the island, who have heretofore not had access to the upper Hawaii slopes.

It would also provide an expanded program for control of feral species and plants in an effort to preserve the Hawaiian ecosystems. This valuable conservation effort is greatly needed for continuance of endangered plant species and, in particular, the ohia trees.

Extra camping in these areas would increase those facilities already in short supply.

We feel that this project is a worthy one; however, we reserve our total support until such time as complete information is available as to exact location of proposed roads and accesses.

Respectfully submitted,



C.J. Kimberly
1st Vice President
in charge of Public Affairs
On behalf of the Kona Outdoor Circle

2/22/74

made by the State and County, I find the same road in the same place on State and County plans.

MR. HARRY: In fact, it's in the County Plan as Alternate B at this time.

MR. TASSILL: Knowing that it's coming out of the taxpayers money-- where will the actual cost of this road come out of should you return to Alternate B?

MR. BARREL: Funds appropriated by the United States Congress.

MR. TASSILL: Even though it's in State and County studies?

MR. MORTIMORE: The fact that it's on State and County plans is-- as far as I know, correct me if I'm wrong--simply in response to this plan which was prepared at that time. It wasn't their proposal, as much as they presumably at that time thought it was a good idea. Now the question is, will they respond to this one and change their plan according to this.

MR. HARRY: We haven't officially heard from the County of Hawaii yet.

MR. TASSILL: In reading the West Hawaii studies and County General Plan, I think it was also explored. I find the road showing up again. When was this plan first drawn up?

MR. BARREL: Summer of 1970.

MR. TASSILL: Now, how about prior to 1970, was that road proposed?

MR. MORTIMORE: I think it started back in the middle 60's, some of the discussions, I would say by early 1968 or 1969.

MR. TASSILL: These are the years that the studies were made, and these are the years that the road showed up.

MR. MORTIMORE: It really began to be talked about; we talked to a lot of people about it.

MR. TASSILL: In fact, I don't even see the spur going up to the Saddle Road on this plan anymore. There was a spur on the saddle.

MR. MORTIMORE: That is an incorrect thing on my part; there should have been one. There was a spur road right here over to the saddle. As a matter of fact, I should put that on there as it is part of the plan.

MR. TASSILL: In regard to what Councilman Kawahara just mentioned in regard to the quarter mile thing about the shoreline, I've read in your study on page 20 of the Wilderness Study: "Fishing is an appropriate use and will be permitted under applicable rules and regulations." Now, how will this apply to the Kalapana Extension?

MR. HARRY: If that were done exactly like this, I'm sure that the Kalapana fishing provision which allows Kalapana Hawaiians to fish along this shoreline to a point over to here would still apply to people fishing from the land. If this were added, it would depend on the wording of the law. It would have to be new language in a new Act, to have the Kalapana Hawaiians have the sole fishing rights if they were, say, fishing from a boat. For example, now it would be legal for anybody to come in from a boat and fish up to the edge of the shore whether or not they were Kalapana Hawaiians. I'm not a Kalapana Hawaiian. Suppose I got on a boat in Kaimu and came down here and fished off the shoreline, it's not the National Park--it's State--if I fished from a boat out in the ocean.

MR. TASSILL: Then I misinterpreted the law. According to the act in the Kalapana Extension it does entail the boundaries from Wahaula up until that other point, that these are the areas that Kalapana people and their guests can fish. Now you're saying to me that if I get on a boat at South Point and come around, nobody can throw me out.

MR. HARRY: How could I? If I took you to court, I don't have jurisdiction because you're on State water.

MR. TASSILL: Then I misinterpreted the law, and I think a lot of other people did also. How would this new law affect us?

MR. HARRY: It would be the same as it is today.

MR. TASSILL: Only thing--the direct relationship to the people who are living in the area would have direct konahiki rights, fishing rights, to and up until the quarter mile?

MR. BARREL: No, it would take special legislation to restrict that fishing in that quarter-mile strip off the Kalapana Extension to Kalapana Hawaiians and their guests.

MR. MORTIMORE: Unless you change the current law by legislation, even just adding that quarter mile would not change the present restriction of Kalapana Hawaiians fishing from land. There would have to be something in the new law that would actually change the other; supersede it, otherwise there would be no change.

MR. CHAPMAN: Let me make one comment in the light of what you have just said. That is, what you read were policies that apply to all National Parks, but when we come to a specific area, when there is legislation as there was in the Kalapana Extension for Hawaii Volcanoes, that takes place over this. So don't be misled by this as modifying today what happens at Kalapana.

MR. TASSILL: How big an area would this entail--the quarter-mile addition?

MR. MORTIMORE: Five thousand acres.

MR. HARRY: It's a little less than 30 miles.

MR. TASSILL: This would be bringing in Kalapana?

MR. HARRY: It would go from about Wahaula down to the Great Crack area in the Kau Desert. It's pretty much all big sea cliff except for one little bay at Halape.

MR. TASSILL: I follow you.

MR. HARRY: This part of it is Kalapana Extension provision and this part of it is like any other seacoast.

MR. TASSILL: In this legislation, knowing that people from Kau and Kohala still fish in that area, how would legislation be written in this specific area and the waters it encompass? Would this give the people living in the area the rights to fish there also?

MR. HARRY: As I see it there would be no restriction on people who were fishing for themselves, not commercially.

MR. TASSILL: That's the type of fishing I'm talking about--whether I fish for a living or whether I'm going to supplement my table meal.

MR. HARRY: Now let's say the thorniest one might be opihi picking. You know, if you're picking a bunch of opihis for a luau I can see "no sweat." But if you had a 10-horse string going in struggling out with gallons and gallons of opihis that end up in Oahu, I think we'd be a lot more restrictive.

MR. TASSILL: But if this is my livelihood?

MR. HARRY: Then I think we need to look at the fact, that the way it's happening now is that that picking that's going on there is enormously exploitive.

MR. TASSILL: Whether I fish for opelu, akule, or opihi (shellfish)--this is my living; this is my livelihood. How will it affect me?

MR. HARRY: I believe that if the extension went in as a national park extension it would restrict you much more on the commercial fishing. I think it would be tougher on you; you'd have a harder time. I think that what we're trying to do is to stop the kind of use that the opihi would be gone in 10 years. I look for it to be the kind of thing that we should manage these things so that they continue on and on.

MR. TASSILL: Is there any way that legislation could be written in such a way that a licensed fisherman would have that prerogative?

MR. HARRY: Can you give us some help by what you mean by the kind of things you'd like to see. You don't need to answer that right here and now, but we'd be interested in your thoughts.

MR. TASSILL: You know, the thing that I'm looking for is there are still people from Milolii who continue toward Kahulu--fishing, picking up crab and opihi. This is their livelihood. If he's a commercial fisherman, then I don't think he should be restricted in any way. It's just like what we're experiencing now. Telling the service station man when to open up shop and when to close, when to pump gas, and who to pump gas for, how many gallons you can pump for John Doe and Jill so and so. It's an encroachment on one's constitutional rights.

MR. BARREL: Joe, I think we could use help from you in figuring out a way to resolve both problems or to keep both things going. The problem that we foresee is that the commercial fisherman will not have any fish to fish for if there aren't some restrictions that help perpetuate the species of shellfish that he's after. So doing things in a very long-term way, I for one am worried about the Milolii fisherman starving because there is nothing to catch, because of fishing pressure. So far as I know, and I'm certainly no expert on this, I don't believe the fishing pressure on the Kau Coast is probably that heavy. Some day it may be, and if it is, and all the fishing in Hawaii goes down the drain, then we will all be the poorer. So it seems to me there should be some way of insuring that there will be fish to catch.

MR. TASSILL: It's stated in the County studies that your fish is concentrated from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 miles from the shoreline. The reason for this is that bigger fish eat smaller fish; and smaller fish tend to hang around the shoreline. Because we know of this and because these are the areas where fishermen do most of their fishing, 85 to 90 percent of their fishing, then some sort of legislation should be written in to protect their wage earnings and also, on the other, to protect the Hawaiian life in the area. I'm in total agreement with what you're saying as far as rules and regulations, but the only part that I'm a little scared about is maybe the rules and regulations may hang up a couple of guys.

MR. BARREL: Also, what we're saying, I think, is that the way we propose it in this alternate is not necessarily the best way to do it.

Maybe it should be done by State law, State legislation that takes into account the small-scale commercial fisherman.

MR. TASSILL: They had some legislation in the past couple of years; it never really passed the floor (in regard to opihi picking). Apparently, nothing has been done to these resolutions, and there hasn't been any law enacted as of yet, at least not that I know of.

MR. HARRY: I think the recovery would be rapid if some sort of legislation should be passed. What if that water strip along there were narrower, say if it were 1/8 of a mile, would you feel better about it? We're interested in right up tight to the shore and the water falls off pretty deep there fast. Do you have any feelings on that?

MR. TASSILL: That would be about 500 or 600 feet?

MR. MORTIMORE: About 650 feet, something like that.

MR. HARRY: You're talking about guys coming in fishing by boat, aren't you?

MR. TASSILL: Just local fishing that go up and down that coastline, because there's a lot of guys who go over to Kau from Milolii. There's a lot of guys who drive over and boat from there. In my past experience working for Mil-Ka-Ko we had a lot of fish coming out from Kau and Naalehu.

MR. HARRY: They were putting their boat in and fishing that shore by boat. What would we do to those people? Would we hurt them as badly if instead of 1/4 mile it were 1/8 mile? Did they get that close to the sea cliffs?

MR. TASSILL: Well, I'm not in a position to answer this. As far as that goes, I think there's an opportunity to go back to the drawing board and check it out.

MR. BARREL: Well, that's the reason we're having these meetings. We're getting input like this from people like you and finding out more than we knew before.

MR. MORTIMORE: Seems like we've got three issues that we've sort of touched on. (1) We're talking about recognition that perhaps something needs to be done in the way of control; we'll make that assumption first. Maybe something needs to be done to control the use of the resources so it will continue to be available for people from Milolii or wherever for fishing. (2) Second thing is, what kinds of regulations are needed; what regulations do we need to accomplish that? (3) The third thing, is who should initiate it?

MR. TASSILL: Will this affect the waters off City of Refuge?

MR. BARREL: No, that's separate.

MR. TASSILL: Maybe I'm monopolizing the floor; maybe somebody else has something else to say.

MR. HARRY: I'll try to keep an eye--is somebody looks like they are antsy to say something, I'll cut you off.

MR. TASSILL: I'd like to discuss the article in yesterday's (Honolulu) Advertiser, on Alma Cooper in regard to the Kalapana Extension, the homestead thing. Is there any plans in the near future to get these homesteads acted on?

MR. HARRY: We have a lot of hangups about the homesites thing, and I don't know what the answer is. I believe that the proposals here do not foreclose the homesite provision. We have nothing here in any of the alternatives that would change things. The situation right now is that the people who have applied for homesites--I have recommended

that they not be granted, and it's in limbo at the moment. I look at the thing that the Secretary may grant homesites, not that he has to grant homesites. Mrs. Cooper believes that he has to grant homesites, and I don't know who's right. All I can say is that the proposals here stay the same. We are not by new legislation changing the law on Kalapana homesites so that as time goes by there can be more discussion on it to try to figure out whose on the right on the thing.

There is an alternative in the wilderness plan that considers taking a piece of the park, and taking it out the park, and giving it to someone like Hawaiian Homes that is in that sort of business, that we're not, to have that for Hawaiian homesites. The problem I have right now and why I've recommended against it, at least for the moment, is that in my mind when the bill was passed life was really simple. You didn't have to have roads; you didn't have to have water lines or sewer systems, or electric lines going to your house. I don't know how to do it at this time. If there's a housesite out in here and the accompanying expense of sewer, water, and electricity-- I'm more afraid of that than the housesite.

One thought is that this is being subdivided along here. It may be a compromise between my stand way over here in left field and Mrs. Cooper's way over there, would be to take a chunk in here. As the County water line is in here, it would be in close proximity to the services that people today would look for in a housesite than in 1938 I wouldn't have thought about. I don't know if that's the way to go but I think that it's worth looking over those possibilities.

MR. TASSILL: You mentioned the possibility of taking out some acreage from the park and handing it over to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

MR. HARRY: That is only a possibility.

MR. TASSILL: Is there any possibility of utilizing that land instead of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, which is by Act of Congress also, which is very similar in restricting the act in the Kalapana Extension. What I mean by similarity is that in both acts the people were given the land without promises of getting the land developed by the Federal Government. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in so many words says "here you've got the land, go out and struggle and find the money and try to build your own system, your building code, and stuff like that, and you improve the land yourself." Now, knowing that the Hawaiian Homes Act is an act of rehabilitation to the people, yet it does not in any way give assurance to the people that there will be assistance given. Now, what assistance is given to the homesteader in Kalapana--is there any assistance given to them?

MR. HARRY: None.

MR. TASSILL: So to take these lands, what I'm suggesting is that if the possibility does arise that lands could be given back to the people in some sort of way, that it not be given to the Hawaiian Homes Commission. The reason why I'm saying this is because in the 55 somewhat years that the Hawaiian Homes Commission has been in service (it's the Act of 1919) the commission is not doing their job also due to the fact that the financial situation that they're in. Now, because of this and because of the knowledge of all the works

of the commission in the past 55 years, just giving them the land is just giving them supervision--that's it. As far as giving the people the land outright or making it possible for the people to do something with the land, I think we need to search and find another area. Because the Hawaiian Homes Commission has 200,000 acres, more or less, of which 40,000 acres is fee soil (?) lands, of which I think three times as much or more is leased by people other than Hawaiians. This was made possible in 1958, I think it was, but it was made possible by general legislation of general leases that people of other than Hawaiian ancestry be given the opportunity to lease Hawaiian Home lands, then the actual program of rehabilitation has not been served as of yet. So I am not only recommending the feeling that in the event that we do have this opportunity to give some of your lands back to the Hawaiian people, I hope you won't do it this way. Although the intentions were good, the actual projections and the actual purpose has not been carried out. I think there are other avenues--whether it be given to a corporation or whether it be utilized within the Aloha Group at least that somebody else be given a chance.

I'm kind of inclined to go along with Alma in regards to what she said about the Kalapana Extension about the homestead sites. I think that maybe legislation doesn't show or prove that the National Park must, but because maybe in so many words the National Park did at that period of time make some sort of commitment, at least try to carry it out. I think for a lot of the people to go back to Kalapana; a lot of people to utilize the act, especially in this day and time knowing that there's a lot of subdivisions coming up in the area and

accessibility to the necessary utilities such as electricity and water will be more available now than it has ever been. I understand what you just got through saying. That a house may be up in the kuahiwis. Maybe it should be that the national parks do designate an area for subdivision. In the event that you do this, I again hope that you don't do this for less than an acre. I think it should be more than an acre. Any homesite, any house site, should be more than an acre. The reason for this is that once it becomes less than an acre and not of agriculture purposes, then you've lost the intent of homestead. Then the restrictions on the building codes and living codes are too hard for the people to handle. What I'm saying is, he can't go out and raise his 10 chickens. Last week Sunday there was a beautiful article in the Sunday Advertiser about the Keamos--where they started with 10 chickens--and there were 50 people in one picture of a family of 60, something like that. Given an opportunity to go back to the land to raise their crops for their own subsistence. Anyway, these are the areas where I'd like to see more energies put into. Thank you.

MR. HARRY: Thank you, Joe. Do we have any other speakers?

MR. QUIST: Yes, Mr. Cooper.

MR. ALIKA COOPER: You know, I think it was March 3, 1973 we had one of these meetings, and I asked you for a transcript in its entirety of the meeting. I never received this transcript and I'm wondering if the material that I spoke about ever got back to Washington.

MR. BARREL: That was a pre-planning meeting. We asked anybody to come and give us advice before we began to develop plans, and we

were the people doing the planning--we took the information that we got.

MR. COOPER: O.K. What I'd like to do, I don't have a copy today, but I'd like to send you a copy that I'd like to be included both in the wilderness, which is today, and the master plan, which is tomorrow. Is that all right? (Copy enclosed--see Appendix A)

MR. BARREL: It's the other way around. Today is master plan; tomorrow is wilderness.

MR. COOPER: I'd like the one in March 3, 1973 to be included so I'll send you a copy.

MR. BARREL: O.K., fine.

MR. COOPER: I want to speak briefly about the master plan. I think the master plan has been upgraded a great deal since the 1970 master plan. There are some good points in the master plan. Some of the points such as studies, more cabins in wilderness areas, and things like this make a lot of sense. Unfortunately, I see nothing there for the bigger things, such as personnel. I'd like to start being very positive about recommendations and alternatives here.

First, I'd like to speak about the wilderness area. The wilderness area proposed at this time is not timely; not for us here in Hawaii. At present the Aloha Association is drawing up legislation to be presented to the Congress as a reparation act. This wilderness area will probably have an adverse effect on this reparation act, so we ask that the wilderness plans area be put aside for at least a 10-year period. I don't think anyone in the next 10 years is going to desecrate that national park. I've been listening to people who come

from the mainland about wilderness areas, and there's so many laws on the wilderness areas, depending on the management of the park, that it becomes . . . I don't think we need this here in Hawaii now. There are many rules and regulations that can be misinterpreted and misleading in a wilderness area.

The proposed wilderness area study and environmental statement has been drawn up by people who obviously are not knowledgeable with our way of life, our unique culture heritage. The wilderness plan is very inappropriate at this time.

2. I want to speak about the Olaa Forest Reserve, comprised of approximately 9,600 acres--be repared to the native Hawaiian people. Since the Olaa Forest Reserve is not in any way touching the national park, it is illegal by your laws to acquire it. It should be set aside and turned over to the Aloha Group for the native Hawaiian people.

3. All religious, cultural, historical burial grounds and places within the national park and ample buffers around these areas should be turned back to the native Hawaiian people in the reparations act. I think this is very important. All discrepancies that have occurred in these historical areas should be corrected to the desires of these Hawaiians. The cost shall be the responsibility of the national park.

4. I want to speak about Ainahou Ranch, which is approximately 6,300 acres plus--shall be returned to the Bishop Estate for it was purchased illegally and against the national park's laws. Another thing, I don't see why the national park really needs that ranch.

5. I want to talk about the Kalapana Extension Act, realizing in this Kalapana Extension Act that there were three original agreements.

Out of the three there's only two left, and neither of them were correct. The first agreement was that there would be homesites for native Hawaiians. The second agreement was that the people whose villages adjoined the national park could hunt in the national park if they were Hawaiian and also could fish in the national park if they were Hawaiian. Now when these laws came about later on only the people from Kalapana can fish in the Kalapana Extension; the hunting was taken out completely, and these are very sad things. We would like to see this hunting be put back in. Kalapana Extension, Kamoamoa, Laeapuki, Panau, and Panau Nui should be put into homestead lands for Hawaiians, the cost would be cared for by the national park. These are all development costs and housing at today's standards. I think because the national park was very neglectful in carrying through this homesite agreement, that they would have to carry the responsibility and finance the development at today's standards. I don't think this is asking too much.

6. All geothermal and mineral rights on the land owned, given, condemned for the national park and lands to be gotten from other sources should belong to the landowners. The largest landowner you have in the national park is Bishop Estate. An example, all Bishop Estate lands that have been given, sold, etc., all geothermal rights belong to the Bishop Estate to educate our Princess Pauahi Bishop's children. I think this is only fair.

7. Personnel. I think if this personnel situation was straightened out that you would find things would go much easier for the national park. In the historical areas, I think all Civil Service

standards should be waived. If it's a historical area, there should be Hawaiians in a historical area from the management down. I think that as far as personnel in these parts, we should have knowledgeable people of the lands of the area. Unfortunately, there have been many drastic mistakes in the last 58 years. Some of the personnel have been very good, some haven't. They're not sympathetic to our needs or our causes and to the environment that they live in. This is why the problems crop up as they have.

8. Goats. Now this is the typical example of personnel. I want to tell you a little bit about the history of goats, because I think it's very important for the national park to understand about the goats. In your wilderness and master plan you speak of fencing the national park in 5,000-acre areas, plots, so you can control the goat population. This is absolute nonsense. We don't want to see our national park all fenced up like a cattle ranch. This is a national park; let's keep it as a national park. We are in agreement that the old fencing should be patched and replaced. Also the park boundaries should be surveyed and they should be fenced; but no new fences in new areas.

Let me tell you about the goat history. The goat was introduced in Hawaii when Captain Cook landed in Niihau in 1778. In 1780 the goat was introduced both to Kau and the Puna area. From 1800 to 1916 when the national park took over these lands, many Hawaiians made their livelihood on goats. The skins were sold, the meat were sold and dried, and Mr. Pea had a goat contract with the Bishop Estate from Kuee Ruins or Waiwelawela in Kalapana. He lived at Panau and he carried out his

goat operation from Panau. When the national park came into being in 1916 they stopped most of this operation; he was told to get his goats out of the national park. He couldn't use this area as he and his family had been using it for well over a hundred years, so he's confined to the present Kalapana Extension area which is approximately 42,000 acres. This was a real economic blow to the Pea family.

Now by 1918, the national park just let the goats grow. The national park let the goats inbreed and increase so by 1930 the goats were out of the control for the first time in Hawaii--for the first time they were out of control. At this time the goats were driven by the Army, the National Guard, and whoever wanted to drive the goats. The first drive netted over 7,000 goats. They were driven down to Apua and they were slaughtered. Hawaiians such as Dan Kamelamela, Keala, Kanaela, Olu, and others drove the goats until Martial Law came into the park on December 7, 1941. The goats were down to a bare minimum.

In 1946 Gordon McKenzie, who lives in Kona, took the contract for driving the goats. By this time, in 1946, it was 6 years that the goats weren't driven, and there was a tremendous amount of goats. In 4 years McKenzie and his boys caught over 16,000 goats. Right after this the national park stopped everybody from driving, shooting, and hunting goats.

In 1950 the goat population was down to less than 200 goats in the national park. This was by driving. This was only the goats that were taken and sold--16,000. There was probably 10,000 that were shot. From 1950 to 1960 the park wouldn't allow anyone to shoot, drive, rope, or

harm the goats. By 1960 the goats had multiplied to probably between 25,000 and 30,000 goats. The park then started to drive again. Unfortunately, even with a helicopter the national park personnel can't control the goats. This is one reason we should have a change in management. Now the goats are a problem, but I sure cannot see fencing the whole national park into 5,000 and 10,000-acre blocks to control the goats--this is not necessary.

9. Exotic plant control. Actually there are very few exotic plants in the national park along the trails, but when they built the Kalapana Road in the early 1960's this is when the exotic plants started to come in--the guava, the lantana, the Joe-weed. Visually, I have not seen any control whatsoever. I talked to this guy Tobin who was the Superintendent, and a couple of other people, and I don't know what the problem is. But these exotic plants have to be controlled. You have to have a good control program because they're just going to take over. It's sad to go to an area that I've worked in for many years and here we have all these plants coming up along the road.

10. Offshore lands, approximately 5,400 acres, 1/4 mile from shore. These are some of the best fishing grounds in the State. Due to a long distance in travel to fish here both by mule or walking, or by helicopter, or by boat from Hilo or Kau the roughness of the ocean and the coastline, there is no reason for the national park to control these waters. The State of Hawaii seems to be doing a pretty good job. These fishing grounds are some of the best fishing ports for the deep sea fish, migrating fish, and local indigenous fish. In no way should the national park control these waters. Now let me give

you an example. There's places off Puna and Kau the national park has over 30 miles of coastline that less than 1,000 feet offshore you're in water as deep as 100 to 150 fathoms of water. Access to this area is really very hard; very few commercial fishermen fish here. So I think nature takes care of this problem here; I feel nature takes care of this problem here very well.

11. When the Ad Hoc Committee fought against the national park's master plan in 1970 and won, our Ad Hoc Committee's stand was that no land was to be acquired by the national park till the discrepancies of the historic sites was corrected. As of this date, I see that the national park hasn't made any attempt to correct any of the discrepancies and yet they have money to buy Ainalou Ranch. Till these discrepancies of the historical areas are corrected and until the alternatives mentioned here are cared for, the national park should not acquire any land--no land whatsoever.

Another point I'd like to talk about is that some day we're going to have to have a road from Kona to Hilo. It's 120 miles one way, and it's 90 miles the other way. If we went right over the mountain we could make it in 55 to 60 miles. If we do turn over that area up there between Mauna Loa and Hualalai to the national park at this time, we probably would never get access through this national park land or any wilderness land. So I think that we should hold off until we get a road through there. I'm in agreement that Hualalai should be preserved, but I'm not sure it should be preserved by the national park at this time. I think maybe Bishop Estate has had it for all these years and they've done very little with it; I'm sure it will

still be available a little later. So until these discrepancies on the historical sites are corrected, I don't want to see the national park get any more land.

Now another thing that always upsets me is that in the master plan and wilderness plan--if you look at the master plan and turn to page 75--you will find that most of the work that was done there was done not by the local knowledgeable people of the area; it was done by the national park people. I'm really not so sure if they really have the broad concept and the understanding of our park and our culture and our heritage. I think it would be very meaningful the next time the national park draws up a master plan if they would consult with local people, local Hawaiians who are knowledgeable in the areas, for these lands originally were our lands or the lands of the Hawaiians. I want to thank you very, very much today for coming to your meeting. Thank you.

MR.HARRY: Do we have any others that wish to testify now? I've gone through the list of people that wish to testify so I'll declare that we are in recess, but we'll be around here until 5:00 p.m. and we'll also meet again at 7:00 o'clock this evening.

(At 4:00 p.m. a recess was taken until 7:00 p.m., at which time the meeting reconvened.)

EVENING SESSION

Meeting reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

MR. HARRY: (At 7:30 p.m.) It's four to zero in favor of deferring all further conversation until the wilderness meeting tomorrow morning so we're going to close these meetings for now.

(Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.)

TITLE: REACTION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
HAWAIIAN PEOPLE TO THE NATIONAL
PARK SYSTEM ON THE ISLAND OF HAWAII

SUBMITTED BY: THE CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN
PEOPLE AT THE OPEN MEETING
IN HILO ON MARCH 3, 1973
CONDUCTED BY REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL
PARK

Prepared by:

Alma Kaiama Cooper, Co-Chairman, Historic
Sites Committee

Alika Cooper, Co-Chairman, Historic Sites
Committee

This impact statement is titled, "Reaction of the Congress of the Hawaiian People to the National Park System on the Island of Hawaii."

It is fitting and proper that this document is presented at this open meeting in Hilo on this Saturday, March 3, 1973 for it is the purpose of this meeting for "interested persons to voice views regarding the designation of wilderness areas and development of a master plan at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park."

It is precisely appropriate that the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE submit this impact statement, for the total area embodied within the boundaries designated as the Hawaii National Park System was once crown and government lands of the Hawaiian Monarchy or were owned by Native Hawaiian people. This concept of original ownership is significant to the rising issue of the title rights of the descendants of the aboriginal people based upon aboriginal use and occupancy. The CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE is an organization whose membership is made up of the descendants of the aboriginal people of the Hawaiian Islands.

"Formed in October 1971, The Congress has as its major purpose: To seek solutions to problems affecting the economic, social and educational welfare of the Hawaiian people and to bring about the uplift of our people.

Further, The Congress will promote cultural identity and pride among the Hawaiian people by highlighting and perpetuating Hawaiian heritage programs.

Additionally, by the mandates of its constitution, The Congress will encourage and support the involvement and participation of Hawaiians in forming public policies and decisions which may affect their welfare."¹

The CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE is the organization that led the public campaign to preserve Kaloko Fish Pond and the Honokohau Settlement National Historic Landmark in its entirety. This concerted public campaign for preservation of a significant landmark recorded in the National Register resulted in the passage of H.R. 11774 and the signing of this bill by President Richard Nixon on June 30, 1972.²

In the annals of its events as related to the issue of the Honokohau Settlement National Historic Landmark in which is situated Kaloko Pond, the CONGRESS OF HAWAIIAN PEOPLE has recorded a significant entry. On November 3, 1971, six Hawaiians appeared before the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in Washington, D.C. Retired Colonel Arthur Chun, Charles Hoopai, George Penehaka, Isaiah Kaaihue, Alma Cooper, and Alika Cooper presented their substantiated case against the Kona Coast Development Co. and its proposed alteration to Kaloko Pond and its proposed commercial development within this National Landmark. The Hawaiian contingency and Representative Patsy T. Mink were

¹Agard, John M., First Vice President, Congress of the Hawaiian People.

²H.R. 11774 was introduced by Representative Patsy T. Mink on November 15, 1971.

able to show that the proposed development plans would create ADVERSE EFFECT upon this property which is registered in the National Registry.

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 915), the Effect Criteria are defined as follows:

Effect - A federally financed or licensed undertaking shall be considered to have an effect on a National Register listing (districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects including their settings) when any condition of the undertaking creates a change in the quality of the historical, architectural, archeological or cultural character that qualified the property under the National Register criteria* for listing in the National Register.

Adverse Effect - Generally, adverse effect occurs in conditions which include but are not limited to:

- a. destruction or alteration of all or part of a property;
- b. isolation from or alteration of its surrounding environment;
- c. introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property and its setting.

It is the purposed intent of this impact statement to introduce the claims of the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE that the National Park Service on the island of Hawaii has in fact violated the EFFECT CRITERIA that have been prepared by the National office of the National Park Service and to show just cause for such claims. It is the further intent of the CONGRESS

*These criteria have been prepared by the National Park Service for the use in evaluating properties nominated to the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the National Register.

OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE to mandate to its own body and to the Hawaii sector of the Park Service that the said claims and grievances be presented to the Secretary of Interior, his staff, and to the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Furthermore, the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE recommends that the Department of Interior extend an invitation to three to five persons from the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE to Washington, D.C., whereupon the problems, claims, and grievances will be presented to the Secretary of Interior.

It is right that at this late date, that the Secretary of Interior hear the claims and grievances of the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE for the local representatives of the National Park Service have failed in every instant, to confer with representatives of this Hawaiian Organization who as individuals and as members have been claimants since 1970.

The CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE is aware that the officials of this open meeting on this day of March 3, 1973 have publicly designated that the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park shall be the subject for public expression. However, the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE chooses to include the total National Park System on this Island of Hawaii in this impact statement. The intent and expectations of the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE can be best presented as designed.

The National Park Service controls slightly more than 220,000 acres on the Island of Hawaii. Situated within these park lands are significant religious and cultural sites. They are Wahaula Heiau, Puuloa Petroglyphs, Kaimu Village, Kealakomo Village, Kahue Village, Kilauea Volcano, City of Refuge, Puukohola Heiau, and Mailekini Heiaus.

To apply the ADVERSE EFFECT criteria to the undertakings in particular areas of significant religious and cultural history, each area and the undertakings within, shall be discussed individually. In addition, the symbols a, b, c, will be placed after each statement of the undertaking to indicate the appropriate adverse condition.

Adverse Effect - Generally, adverse effect occurs in conditions which include but are not limited to:

- a. destruction or alteration of all or part of a property;
- b. isolation from or alteration of its surrounding environment;
- c. introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property and its setting.³

WAHAULA HEIAU AND THE KALAPANA INTERPRETIVE CENTER:

Wahaula Heiau is believed to have been built in or before the 13th century by Paao. Paao introduced and carried on the ancient religion and its defined order at this heiau. It has been recorded

³National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 915).

that Wahaula Heiau was probably "the last heiau in which worship was publicly offered to the Hawaiian Gods."

UNDERTAKINGS THAT CAUSE ADVERSE EFFECT:

1. The architecture of the Interpretive Center is closely akin to a Japanese Tea House. (b, c)
2. Lavatories in the Interpretive Center are directly over the ancient Hawaiian trail. (a, b, c)
3. The Interpretive Center is too close to the Wahaula Heiau. (a, b, c)
4. The displays in the Interpretive Center are of general Hawaiiana that bypass the particular historical details of Paao and others who followed him and the significant environment in which the heiau is located. (a, b, c)
5. The interpretive displays are of stylistic design that are inappropriate. Some of the narrative and labels are misleading and inaccurate. (b, c)

According to Kenneth P. Emory, retired anthropologist of the Bishop Museum, "The legitimate complaint is in the art work displayed to give the Hawaiian background. This was done in San Francisco by artists lacking in knowledge of Hawaiian plants and insensitive to the physical characteristics of the Hawaiians."

6. Asphalt paved walkways through the three terraces of the heiau was built for the convenience of the visitors. (a, b, c)

Robert L. Barrel, General Superintendent, National Park Service, wrote on November 5, 1970, "The asphalt walks were put down on top of a carefully laid crushed-rock layer, thus separating the asphalt from the original surface, after serious consideration of the problems of protecting a significant site."

7

Kenneth P. Emory wrote, "It may have been a mistake to apply asphalt to the walkways around Wahaula Heiau, but it was necessary to have walkways so that visitors would not climb over the sites."

CITY OF REFUGE AND THE INTERPRETIVE CENTER

The name City of Refuge is a misnomer. The proper name for this religious and cultural area is Hoonau. This area was probably established in the 1400's by the kings and chiefs as a sanctuary for non-combatants, defeated soldiers, and for the kapu breakers. There were at least five other refuges on the Island of Hawaii, one in every major district, and the "City of Refuge" or Hoonau is the only one to have survived almost intact.

UNDERTAKINGS THAT CAUSE ADVERSE EFFECT:

1. Burials and petroglyphs were covered with asphalt to construct the parking lot. (a, b, c)

Kenneth Emory wrote, "The scattered petroglyphs at Hoonau obliterated by the parking lot and the burials in cracks and under rocks and some cairns were each and everyone thoroughly recorded."

Robert L. Barrell, Superintendent, National Park Service, has written, "The City of Refuge parking lot at Hoonau was carefully designed around the petroglyphs and, I have been assured, did not destroy any of them."

2. The Interpretive Center does not fit into the environment and setting. (a, b, c)
3. The restoration of the Alealea Heiau resulted in the removal of rocks from the structure. When the rocks were replaced and cemented to fit into stabilized security, approximately four truck loads of rocks that were originally a part of this heiau, were removed from the grounds and dumped elsewhere. (a, b, c)
The reconstructed wall of this heiau is no longer straight and the cemented work is totally adverse to this historical structure. (a, b, c)

4. The Great Wall surrounding the refuge area was "opened" in one section to make way for a passage way. Rocks from the Great Wall, a historical structure, were removed to allow for this opening. (a, b, c)
5. The Mamalahoa Trail, a public right of way, significantly important to the native Hawaiians, has been filled with sand and coral, material foreign and non conforming to this site. (a, b, c)
6. The fish pond in the palace grounds is left largely unattended and with fish foreign to a Hawaiian fish pond. (c)

THE PUULOA PETROGLYPH AREA

The Puuloa Petroglypharea contains the largest concentration of petroglyphs since the field at Anaehoomalu has been largely destroyed by the commercial developers who are owners of the property. The Puuloa Petroglyphs include a large field of figures, patterns, and dots. On the top of the hillside are thousands of dots and rings, ranging in size from one to six inches in diameter, on the surface of pahoehoe lava.

ADVERSE EFFECT CAUSED BY FAILURE TO UNDERTAKE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Park Service is guilty of creating adverse effect in this area by failing to effectualize an early recommendation by representatives of Hawaiian people. The recommendation was for the construction and installation of an elevated wooden walk for public use and for the protection of the petroglyphs. Failing to implement this recommendation, adverse effect caused by the careless walk of visitors on the petroglyphs has resulted in the erosion and in many cases, the destruction of these early pictorial remains.(a,c)

KAHUE VILLAGE

The failure of the Park Service to record the site of Kahue Village before the flow of the volcano covered it, four years ago, contributes to a crucial and total loss of a historical site. In this instant, the failure to conduct an archeological study, critical in nature because of the location of the site in the volcano-prone area, has resulted in an adverse situation that can never be regained. (a)

KEANA VILLAGE

The village of Kaena was also destroyed by the volcano last year. Although this area was surveyed and recorded by another agency some years before its destruction by the volcano, this study is inadequate. The Park Service failed to undertake its own archeological survey and recording. This failure to undertake this survey has resulted in an adverse situation that is totally lost and can not be regained.

KEALAKOMO VILLAGE

The request for an archeological survey and recording of the Kealakomo Village was made to the Park Service by Alikea Cooper, Historical Sites Co-Chairman, Congress of the Hawaiian People, when the on coming threat of the volcano flow appeared to be leading to the village. It took four weeks for the park archeologist to begin his work at Kealakomo Village. To this date, no report of whether this study was undertaken and completed before the village was destroyed by the volcano has been received.

It is necessary at this point to strongly state that the decisions for the undertakings that have caused adverse effects in the particular instances sighted beforehand, were made by Park Service personnel. And to add further insult to injury and damages, it will be these same persons who will render the decisions for the restoration of the Puukohola and Mailekini Heiaus in Kawaihae.

At this point in this impact statement, the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE intends to list the following grievances:

LAND ACQUISITION AND RIGHTS FOR THE HAWAIIANS IN THE KALAPANA EXTENSION

Section 1 of the Kalapana Extension Act placed a restriction on the use of Federal money for land acquisition of the tracts to be included in the extension it provided:

That the United States shall not purchase, by appropriation of public moneys, any land within the aforesaid area (Kalapana Extension), but such lands shall be secured by the United States only by public and private donations.

The Territory and, later, the State of Hawaii, acquired the lands of the Kalapana Extension for the United States through donation, exchange, and condemnation with purchase.⁴

In 1938, lands owned by the Hawaiian people in the Kalapana vicinity were condemned for 30¢ (thirty cents) to 60¢ (sixty cents) per acre. The lands that were last condemned in the late 1950's ranged up to \$16 (sixteen dollars) per acre. Today the adjoining lands sell for better than \$1. (one dollar) per square foot on the ocean front.

⁴The Island of Hawaii, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June, 1970.

Some of the Hawaiians whose lands were condemned have not cashed their checks to date for they believe the price received was far below the realistic value of the land. In the language of the youth of this day, the condemnation of these lands in Kalapana may be aptly described as a "rip off".

This "rip off" was to have received some compensation, however. The compensation was to have been provided in Section 3 of the Kalapana Extension Act (52 Stat. 781).

Section 3 of the Kalapana Extension Act (52 Stat. 781), approved June 20, 1938, gives homesite rights to all Hawaiians and fishing rights to native Hawaiians of the Kalapana area. It reads:

Sec. 3 (a) That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease, under such rules and regulations as he may deem proper, land ascertained by him to be suitable for home site purposes in the Kalapana Extension as described herein, to native Hawaiians when such occupancy does not encroach on or prevent free access to any points of historic, scientific, or scenic interest or in any manner obstruct or interfere with protection and preservation of said area as a part of Hawaii National Park; Provided, however, That occupants of homesites shall reside on the land not less than six months in any one year: And provided further, That fishing shall be permitted in said area only by native Hawaiian residents of said area or of adjacent villages and by visitors under their guidance.

(b) The term "native Hawaiian" as used in this section, means any descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778. (16 U.S.C. sec. 396a).⁵

⁵The Island of Hawaii, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June, 1970.

Since 1938, the National Park Service, has failed to present a plan for the designation of the land areas for inclusion of the homesites and has failed to properly advertise the homesite provision to generate applicant requests. Failing to fulfill their legal and moral obligations as provided in Section 3 of the Kalapana Extension Act, the Island of Hawaii, a United States Department of the Interior publication, states on page 46, the following:

The Kalapana Extension Act permits homesites for native Hawaiians on all land which it authorized for addition to the park. (See legal factors under basic data, this report). No application for homesites have been made and it is unlikely any will. It is recommended that the provision be repealed by legislation to protect potential wilderness areas and to prevent a nonconforming use.

The reasons for the lack of applications for homesites warrants investigation. In 1970 however, when this homesite provision was known for the first time by some of the Hawaiian people who read the Island of Hawaii, applications were submitted to the Park Service in the Volcanoes National Park and to the Secretary of Interior. In both counts, the parties filing applications were politely dismissed from any or all constructive help to implement their request for homesites.

THE CONGRESS OF HAWAIIAN PEOPLE hereby mandate the Department of Interior to present a constructive plan for the implementation of the Kalapana Extension Act which permits homesites for all Hawaiians as recorded in Section 3.

It is necessary for the CONGRESS OF HAWAIIAN PEOPLE to present a second grievance, crucial to descendants of the aboriginal people. This grievance is pointed directly to the endorsement and approval of the research proposal submitted to the National Science Foundation titled, "An Investigation of the Hydrothermal Systems at Kilauea Volcano, Hawaii" proposed by the Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado. The intent of this proposal that is scheduled to begin shortly is explained as:

"The first part involves the study of a geothermal system in a well studied and geologically simple environment -- Kilauea Volcano. It is planned that exploration techniques and strategies may be tested here, once it has been established by drilling that in fact a geothermal system exists. Inasmuch as the test area lies in a National Park, there is no intention of suggesting that the system be used to produce power. Quite the contrary, being in a national preserve, the Kilauea geothermal system will assuredly not be altered by production practices, and can remain a prototype for testing geothermal exploration and evaluation techniques for many years.

However, a prototype is of no use unless some application can be made of the things learned from it. Therefore, we are proposing a second part of this program -- an application of current prospecting techniques to a potentially productive area of Oregon."⁶

THE CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE subject the proposed investigation of the hydrothermal systems at Kilauea Volcano to the following strong criticisms and equally strong mandates. These criticisms and mandates are ours to make by virtue of

⁶Research Proposal Submitted To The National Science Foundation, Submitted by Colorado School of Mines, February, 1972.

"aboriginal use and occupancy of lands, creates rights in that land". Our ancestors walked the lands of Kilauea Volcano in humble respect to their goddess, Pele. Kilauea Volcano and the areas surrounding is a religious sanctuary. Our ancestors also used the natural elements such as steam in their life and for their religious and cultural purposes. We are further able to present our strong criticisms and equally strong mandates for there is considerable doubt that the Republic of Hawaii, the government that abrogated the Hawaiian Monarchy, against the consent of Queen Liliuokalani and the Hawaiian people, was the lawfull and rightfull owner of the land that they ceded to the United States Government in Article II in the Treaty of Annexation which reads in part:

The Republic of Hawaii also cedes and hereby transfers to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, government or crown lands, --- together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining; Therefore

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
... that all and singular the property and rights hereinbefore mentioned are vested in the United States of America.

As a result of this enactment, the President of the United States signed into law, the establishment of the Hawaii National Park. Approximately 53,785 acres of land on the island of Hawaii was defined by metes and bounds for inclusion in the Hawaii National Park.

The criticisms waged by the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE are as follows:

1. The decision to approve this project, "An Investigation of the Hydrothermal Systems at Kilauea Volcano, Hawaii" to be conducted on the sacred, religious grounds of our ancestors, did not include the Hawaiian people or their selected representatives. Rather, the decision was made by the National Science Foundation, the Department of Interior, Union Oil, and perhaps, other representatives from large industries.
2. The Environmental Impact Study has not been circulated for public information and reaction.
3. The potential source of hydro-electric power raises the issue of ownership rights and this matter has not been resolved.

The mandates presented by the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE are as follows:

1. The project will not begin as scheduled in March until 60 days after the Environmental Impact Study is distributed to Hawaiian groups and all interested persons.
2. The persons and agencies associated with the project in the way of having given their approval to said project or those who will be engaged in the implementation of the project will arrange for as many meetings with a representative group to be named by the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE. This shall be done before the beginning of the project implementation and during the project. It shall also be necessary that all proposed undertakings must first receive approval by the members of the group to be named by THE CONGRESS OF HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.

THE CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE, in the interest of the general welfare of the citizens of this State of Hawaii, further project the following concerns that are recommended for inclusion in the master plan for the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Backcountry Areas:

1. There are presently inadequate cabins, water facilities, corrale facilities, and the like, along 140 plus miles of trails. For example: There are now 4 (four) cabins in approximately 219,000 acres of land. The one cabin at Halape is locked and is not for public use. The other three cabins are located at Pepeau, Red Hill, and at the top of Mauna Loa. These cabins are in poor condition.

It is proposed that adequate cabin, water, and corrale facilities be made available for use by the general public.

2. The Park Service has failed to encourage the people of Hawaii to use the backcountry. As a matter of fact, the general policies of the Park Service on this island, has been to discourage the wide use of the backcountry.

It is proposed that the master plan include the proposed programs for the use of the backcountry by the citizens of this State and the visitors to this State.

3. There is no horse or mule concession in the park although there are 219,000 acres of backcountry wilderness.

It is proposed that a horse or mule concession be made available to the business entrepreneur as defined in President Nixon's Minority Business Enterprise program.

4. The ancient Hawaiian trails are left unattended and as a result, are inaccessible for public use.

It is proposed that these ancient Hawaiian trails be maintained for use by the general public.

5. The goat problem has continued to exist despite the programs created by the Park Service. The result of

the lack of adequate control grows increasingly obvious for native plants are destroyed and the forest line is visibly receding. It is a fair estimate to note that the goat population today is in excess of 25,000.

It is proposed that the Park Service consult with the local persons who are knowledgeable and experienced in goat control. THE CONGRESS OF HAWAIIAN PEOPLE would be qualified to formulate a practicle program to bring the goat population to control porportions.

In conclusion, the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE believe that the contents contained within this document fall in appropriate ties with the beliefs expressed by President Richard Nixon in his Second Inaugural Address. In part, President Nixon said:

"Abroad and at home, key:to those new responsibilities lies in the placing and the division of responsibility. We have lived too long with the consequences of attempt- to gather all power and responsibility in Washington.

Abroad and at home, the time has come to turn away from the condescending policies of paternalism -- of "Washington knows best."

A person can be expected to act responsibly only if he has responsibility. This is human nature. So let us encourage individuals at home and nations abroad to do more for themselves, to decide more for themselves. Let us locate responsibility in more places. And let us measure what we will do for others by what they will do for themselves.

And let each of us reach out for that one precious quality government cannot provide--a new level of respect for the rights and feelings of one another, a new level of respect for the individual human dignity which is the cherished birthright of every American."

President Nixon's message is in pointed reference to the deep feelings of the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE. We are tired of policies that govern our ancestral sites and the management of such areas for they are made and are directed from Washington, D.C. and by people who are "foreign" to our way of life. In all of the more than fifty years that the National Park Service has been on the Island of Hawaii, there has never been a Hawaiian in top management. This is fact that is demeaning and degrading to the Hawaiian people. It is degrading for a Hawaiian to enter the premises of the Park Services to see that the persons in management are non-Hawaiians. This is fact even as these areas are of high importance and significance as Hawaiian religious and cultural sites. Therefore, in keeping with President Nixon's belief that "a person can be expected to act responsibly only if he has responsibility" and in keeping with his belief that "the time has come to turn away from the condescending policies of paternalism" ^{paternalism} that have has plagued the lives of the Hawaiian people, the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE mandate that all of the positions of management and supervision in the park units on this Island of Hawaii be placed with native Hawaiian people. The CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE further mandate that proceedings for this change of management and supervisory positions be brought to the discussion table on this local level as it will be brought to the attention of the Secretary of Interior and his staff, and to the Congressional members of both houses, and to other persons who are in positions to implement this change.

It is a further mandate of the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE that the Secretary of the Interior create a position in the national office of the Park Service responsible for the affairs of of Hawaiian National Parks and this position shall be filled by a native Hawaiian.

It is a further mandate of the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE that the Hawaiian flag will be flown at each and every premise where the American flag is flown.

The final mandate to be issued in this document by the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE is that the Secretary of the Interior name the memberd of the Kaloko Advisory Board immediately and that the Park Service will request of Representative Patsy T. Mink that the duration for the study be extended to include a full and total year following the official organization of the Kaloko Advisory Board.

MANDATES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE

1. The said claims of ADVERSE EFFECT caused by undertakings as presented in this document shall be placed before the Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, and the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
2. The Department of Interior present a constructive plan for the implementation of the Kalapana Extension Act which permits homesites for all Hawaiians in Sec. 3.
3. The project, "An Investigation of the Hydrothermal Systems at Kilauea, Volcano, will not begin as scheduled and after 60 days after the Environmental Impact Study is distributed to Hawaiian groups and all interested persons will a decision on the date to commence the project be made.
4. The persons and agencies associated with the project for the "Investigation of the Hydrothermal System at Kilauea, Volcano", or those who will be engaged in the implementation of the project will arrange for as many meetings with a representative group to be named by the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE. This shall be done before the beginning of the project implementation and during the project. It shall also be necessary that all proposed undertakings must first receive approval by the members of the group to be named by THE CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.
5. All of the positions of management and supervision in the park units on this Island of Hawaii are to be placed with native Hawaiian people. The proceedings for this change in management and supervisory positions will be brought to the discussion table at the local and national level. Hawaiian representatives to be named by the CONGRESS OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE will be at these meetings.
6. The Secretary of the Interior will create a position in the national office of the Park Service responsible for the affairs of the Hawaiian National Parks and this position shall be filled by a native Hawaiian.
7. The Hawaiian flag will be flown at each and every premise in the park service where the American flag is flown.
8. The Secretary of the Interior shall name the members of the Kaloko Advisory Board immediately and the National Park Service shall request of Representative Patsy T. Mink that she introduce a bill to extend the period for the study to include a full year to commence after the official body of the Kaloko Advisory Council is formed.